

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/824,297		04/14/2004	Robert L. Franch	YOR920030605US1	6059	
33233	7590	07/12/2006		EXAMINER		
		CHARLES W. I	VERBITSKY, GAIL KAPLAN			
	11703 BOWMAN GREEN DRIVE SUITE 100				PAPER NUMBER	
RESTON,	VA 2019	90	•	2859		
				DATE MAILED: 07/12/2006	6	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				//			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/824,297	FRANCH ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	<del></del> ,			
		Gail Verbitsky	2859				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address	;			
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY. PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMU 36(a). In no event, however, may rill apply and will expire SIX (6) N cause the application to become	NICATION.  Ta reply be timely filed  IONTHS from the mailing date of this community ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 Apr	oril 2006.					
• —	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C	C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Dispositi	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) 1,3-7,9-11 and 32-51 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1,3-7,9-11,37-42,47,50 and 51 is/are Claim(s) 32-36,43-46,48-49 is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration. rejected.					
Applicati	ion Papers						
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected drawing(s) be held in abe ion is required if the draw	yance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). ng(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.1				
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) [ a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents  2. Certified copies of the priority documents  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau  See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in ity documents have be ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	n Application No en received in this National Stage	e			
2) Notice 3) Inform	t(s) te of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date	Paper I	w Summary (PTO-413) lo(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 				

Application/Control Number: 10/824,297 Page 2

Art Unit: 2859

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1, 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Javanifard et al. (U.S. 6567763) [hereinafter Javanifard] in view of Beer et al. (U.S. 6612738) [hereinafter Beer].

Javanifard discloses in Fig. 2 an IC temperature sensing device comprising a plurality devices connected together and forming circuit, a switchable current source 120 comprising constant current generators providing a known current to a pn-junction (diode) 110, a voltage measurement device 155 providing temperature related voltage corresponding to pn-junction.

For claim 3: the device converts analog signal to a digital (Fig. 6, step 650) by using an ADC 150.

For claim 5: the device determines difference between first and second (reference) voltages (Fig. 6, step 640). This would imply that the device has a comparator.

Javanifard does not explicitly state that the switch/ clamp selectively shunt the constant current, as stated in claim 1, with the remaining limitations of claims 1, 3-5.

Beer discloses a device in the field of applicant's endeavor wherein a switch 17 is a shunting clamp, which connects lines 11 and 13 or connects lines 11 and 20, i.e., shunting the constant current 31 off the line 11-13. The switch 17 is N-FET.

Page 3

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device disclosed by Javanifard, so as to replace the clamp with a shunting clamp, as taught by Beer, so as to shunt the constant current out during one mode and in the line of interest during the measurement mode, as taught by Beer and very well known in the art.

3. Claims 6-7, 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Javanifard and Beer, as applied to claims 1, 3-5 above, and further in view of Shoji (U.S. 6496056).

Javanifard and Beer disclose the device as stated above.

They do not explicitly teach that the semiconductor is a FET, pn-junction is a FET, and the circuit is a CMOS.

Shoji discloses in Fig. 2-5 and col. 3 a device including all deficient limitations of claims 6.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device disclosed by Javanifard and Beer, so as to have a CMOS circuits with N-FETs and P-FETS, because all of these transistors are alternate types of pn-junctions which will perform the same function of measuring a parameter (temperature) of an IC/ CMOS, if one is replaced with the other.

Claims 6-7, 10-11, 38-42, 47, 50-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as 4. being unpatentable over Javanifard and Beer, as applied to claims 6-8 above, and further in view of Ohshima (U.S. 6441679)

Page 4

Javanifard and Beer disclose the device as stated above.

They do not explicitly teach that the semiconductor device is a FET, pn-junction is a FET, and the circuit is a SOI.

Ohima discloses in Figs. 2-5 a device comprising a temperature sensor, a PN being SOI sensing.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device disclosed by Javanifard and Beer, so as to have a CMOS SOI circuits with N-FETs and P-FETS, because all of these transistors are alternate types of pn-junctions which will perform the same function of measuring a parameter (temperature) of an IC/ CMOS/ SOI, if one is replaced with the other.

Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 5. Javanifard and Beer as applied to claims 1, 3-5 above, and further in view of Benes (U.S. 20030025514).

Javanifard, Beer and Shoji disclose the device as stated above.

They do not explicitly teach the limitations of claim 37.

Benes discloses a device wherein a clamping shunt can be parallel or in series.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make a shunt/ switch parallel/ in series to a source, as Art Unit: 2859

taught by Benes, in order to limit the current to a predetermined level as desired, as very well known in the art.

### Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 32-36, 43-46, 48-49 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed on April 12, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant states that the references do not teach a shunting clamp. This argument is not persuasive because, since applicant does not clearly describe the shunting clamp neither in the specification nor in the claims, any switch, in a broad sense can be considered a shunt because in one position it shorts circuited in another position it opens circuit. However, although Examiner disagrees with the applicant's arguments, the examiner introduces another reference with a switch being clearly shunting clamp.

#### Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The prior art cited in the PTO-892 and not mentioned above disclose related devices and methods.

**Mizuta (U.S. 20030086476)** discloses in Fig. 2 a device in the field of applicant's endeavor comprising a comparator 50 for comparing measured temperature related voltage of an pn-junction with a reference/ preset voltage 60. Mizuta teaches a current

Application/Control Number: 10/824,297

Art Unit: 2859

supplying circuit 20 comprising plurality of FET transistors 23 and a switch (clamp) 24

selectively providing/ shunting the current to a pn-junction 32.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

Page 6

examiner should be directed to Gail Verbitsky whose telephone number is 571/272-

2253. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 to 4:00 ET.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Diego Gutierrez can be reached on 571/272-2245. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**GKV** 

Gail Verbitsky

Primary Patent Examiner, TC 2800

6. Verlisher

January 06, 2006